

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | . FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 09/973,424 | 10/09/2001 | Sudhirdas K. Prayaga | 15966-585CIP2 (Cura-85CIP | 8925 |
| 30623 | 7590 05/27/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C. | | | ANDRES, JANET L | |
| ONE FINANCIAL CENTER | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| BOSTON, MA 02111 | | | 1646 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 05/27/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | 09/973,424 | PRAYAGA ET AL. | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Janet L. Andres | 1646 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl' If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed rs will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 M</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E | action is non-final. | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | |
| 4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,33,36 and 50 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1, 33, 36, 50 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | wn from consideration. | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplished any accomplished any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine | epted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | on No ed in this National Stage | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/973,424 Page 2

Art Unit: 1646

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. Applicant's amendment filed 25 March 2004 is acknowledged. Claims 1, 33, 36, and 50 are pending and under examination in this office action.

Claim Rejections/Objections Withdrawn

- 2. The objection to the title is withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendment removing the word "novel".
- 3. The rejection of claims 2, 4, 27, 28, 39, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is withdrawn in response to Applicant's cancellation of these claims.
- 4. The rejection of claims 1, 33, 36, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chan et al. is withdrawn because Chan et al. does not teach the full-length sequence of the polynucleotide. Had that sequence been presented, the artisan could have at once envisaged the polypeptide sequence and it would have therefore been in the public domain. However, since neither a purified polypeptide, the full sequence of the polypeptide, or any sequence that would lead one to the sequence of the polypeptide are disclosed, the Chan reference does not place the eek protein in the public domain.

New Grounds of Rejection

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1646

6. Claims 1, 33, 36, and 50 are newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

The human eek polynucleotide was identified by Chan et al. by Southern and Northern blot and a partial sequence provided. Chan et al. does not, as Applicant states, provide the full sequence of the polypeptide. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to sequence the polynucleotide and from that sequence obtain the sequence of the eek polypeptide, which comprises instant SEQ ID NO: 66. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do so because Chen et al. teaches that it is a new receptor - type protein tyrosine kinase that might be involved in neoplastic transformation (p. 1060, column 2). Thus one of ordinary skill would have expected the protein to be of interest in human disease and in the study of cell division.

NO CLAIM IS ALLOWED.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janet L. Andres whose telephone number is 571-272-0867. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday, 8:00-5:30.

Art Unit: 1646

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz can be reached on 571-272-0887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Janet L. Andres, Ph.D. Primary Examiner

24 May 2004

BATENI EXAMINES